COPY

A Report of a Meeting of

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

To Hear Comments and Suggestions From Appointing Officers of the City and County of San Francisco Regarding the

SALARY AND WAGE SURVEY REPORT 1945-1946

*****

January 21, 1946

San Francisco, California

GRACE CURTIS
OFFICIAL REPORTER
SAN FRANCISCO

INDEX

A Report of A Meeting of

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

To Receive suggestions and Comments from
The Appointing Officers of the City and
County of San Francisco Regarding the

SALARY AND WAGE SURVEY REPORT 1945-1946

January 21, 1946
Room 154, City Hall
San Francisco

Present:

MILTON MAXWELL, Vice-President

HARRY K. WOLFF

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1946 - 3:20 O'CLOCK, P. M.

---ooo---

(Mr. Milton Maxwell, Vice-President, presided.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We were waiting for our President to arrive. It is now twenty after three, and he must have been detained someplace, so the Commission will open and we will proceed.

On January, the 17th, you received a letter from the Commission which said in part "The Commission will meet in conference with appointing offices, January 21, 1946, to receive their suggestions and comments regarding the Salary Standardization Report." The purpose of this conference is to afford the appointing officers an opportunity to express their views in respect to the indicated new schedules as set forth in the report, particularly for administrative positions and some executive positions within the respective departments.

Now, the Commission would be very pleased to hear from any of you executives, and when you rise, will you please give your name and your title and the department you represent for the information of the Commission. What is being said here today is being taken down by a court stenographer. We are ready to proceed and the floor is open to you gentlemen at this time.

MR. THOMAS K. MC CARTHY: (Treasurer) Members of the Commission, I am over here today on behalf of my staff. Some of them, on the survey, their salaries are contemplated being

reduced. I particularly indicate several of the tellers in my office. Their classification is as Tellers, but really they are tellers, not in the sense of a teller in a bank, because, take Robert Quinn, who is now at the maximum of his salary, $250. He is reduced to $240. I would like to say, in addition to the duties of this man as Teller, this teller is about 50 percent teller. He has charge of $50,000,000 in securities belonging to the retirement system. It is his duty -- and I might say he has been complimented time and time again by certified public accountants in the manner in which he keeps his securities -- he has to prepare the detail work, cut the coupons, and have those things all ready at the maturity date. The same thing applies to Mr. Denney, who is the Senior Teller. He has charge of approximately about the same amount of securities that belong to the banks of the City and County of San Francisco. For every hundred thousand dollars deposited in the banks, the banks give us one hundred ten thousand dollars in securities, bonds. He is reduced $10, too.

As I said before, they are not particularly Tellers. They have other very important duties to do, and I think when a man is in charge -- one man in charge of $40,000,000 securities; the other man approximately the same -- I think those are very, very important duties; more so than just exactly a teller.

Now, we have Mr. Games, who is the Senior Teller in our office. His classification is a Teller and he has in no sense the duty at all in the line of a Teller. He is assistant to

Mr. Cusack in charge of the Inheritance Tax Department. Cames was cut down $10 and I might say I don't think there is any more important two positions in the City Government than the man in charge of the Inheritance Tax Department and his assistant. I might call your attention to the fact that the three men that do that, the State Controller, Mr. Harry Riley thought that work so important that at the last session of the legislature he allowed us an increase of $3,000. The City doesn't pay anything at all to take care of the work of the Inheritance Tax Department. They were allowing $14,000. They have increased that to $17,000. I would say that that work actually costs about, now maybe $13,000 or $14,000. So, I always have been under the impression that Mr. Cusack's position ought really to bring a higher salary than $400. And the same thing applies to Mr. Cames, I think, in his position, because I think Mr. Wolff and the attorneys of San Francisco know the valuable assistance those men are to the attorneys of San Francisco, as well as to the people. When they open safe deposit boxes, I think you will agree it is a very, very important work for everyone concerned in it.

I think that the classification of my other assistant cashier, Mr. Goodman, I talked the matter over with Mr. Henderson, and we thought of filing that "Chief Assistant" position, but I wrote a letter to the Commission regarding that, and I sometimes think it is not a very safe thing to do on behalf of Mr. Goodman because I don't know how long I will be Treasurer and a new Treasurer might come in and he may remove

Mr. Goodman from that position, so I think that I would rather suggest to the Commission if they would increase his maximum from $400 to whatever they may see fit. I think both of these positions, Mr. Cusack's, and Mr. Goodman's, should carry a salary of at least $450.

Now, as I say, the other general clerks in my office, likewise -- like all the general clerks in the survey -- have been cut down $10 and I don't think at this particular time, I think men of that type are very good clerks and they have families to raise, and I believe that their salary should not be reduced.

I don't want to take up your time a great deal, because you have got a lot to do. Briefly, that is my objection and my suggestion. If there are any questions you would like to ask me, I would be pleased to answer.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: I have no questions.

MR. WOLFF: No.

MR. MC CARTHY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: We will proceed right along. Mr. Ososke?

MR. GEORGE OSOSKE (Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court): I would like briefly to establish the departmental structure in order that you might get a picture so we could compare it with another city, let's say, Los Angeles. The Juvenile Court Department, of San Francisco, as you know, provides a service to the community that is unequalled in any other city. I say that because of this fact, that there is a separation between

the Juvenile Court and the Adult Department. In Los Angeles they have one division. However, the two departments here are very much apart to this extent, the Juvenile Court Department has 136 people in the staff, with the Adult Department having 16; and with the Juvenile Court Department having a budget of over $1,200,000, and the Adult Probation has something like $52,000. I bring that comparison up because the Los Angeles Department salaries are increased on a much higher ratio than what they are in San Francisco. The Chief Probation Officer -- which salary I protest that was recommended by the staff -- receives $10,000 in Los Angeles. In San Francisco the range has been $350 to $450 with an increase recommended on the minimum up to $400 and the maximum up to $480, or a difference of $40 on the maximum salary.

Now, it is rather difficult to understand the structural part of the Juvenile Court of San Francisco because of this reason: Los Angeles department handles only probation work they have no responsibility for the Detention Home. That is entirely a separate entity and is handled by a superintendent direct to the Probation Committee. They have no responsibility toward ranches or schools or camps; strictly probation.

The San Francisco Juvenile Court takes in the Detention Home. The Chief Probation Officer is given complete and full responsibility for all of the divisions within the department; the Detention Home, Log Cabin Ranch, Laguna Honda Children's Home, and now a new school created for girls, the Ocean View

School. This, of course, is different than any other county because they do not have the separate divisions.

I would also like to bring out that I have one assistant -- that is, the administrative assistant who handles the full responsibility for the financial affairs of the Department. His salary has been on a range of $300 to $375. That has been recommended for reduction to $280 to $335. This, I feel, is entirely out of proportion because the responsibilities there are comparable at least to any other position in the City Department on an administrative basis, for an assistant who acts as Acting Chief Probation Officer in my absence, or to any division, say, comparable to the Los Angeles office where there are three assistants in the department all receiving a minimum of $400 per month.

I do want to express appreciation for the encouragement given on the increases recommended for Probation Officers and the Senior Probation Officer and some of the other officers in our department. The recommendation of $215 to $260 on the Probation Officer is very helpful. I hope that in the hearings of the individual staff members that can be increased to around $250 to $300. The work they are doing, the demands on their education -- which is a college graduate and two years of experience or a college graduate and graduate work for two years -- demands a higher salary in comparison with what we ask for. We have people in the Department who have had to hold part time jobs in order to make an adequate living. That, of course, is

an injustice to the work that they perform. It is not proper to the children that they handle on a welfare basis, nor is it adequate to them, themselves.

The attendants, I want to sincerely commend the Commission's staff on increasing that salary from $150 to $175 to what it is now: $175 to $210. That is very good. And we hope also that when it does come before the Commission, that they will render assistance in bettering that range.

But, I do again emphasize the two executive position; that is, the Chief Probation Officer and the administrative assistant. I say that on this basis: That we have new building facing us of $1,250,000 which we must do total planning for. We are on twenty-four service. In other words, we are called at all hours of the day and night. The handling of institutional work, especially where children are involved, means that you have the health problems, you have the purchasing of food, the distribution of food, clothing, and all of the other complications that go with an institution. The Public Relations program that is carried on is a must, because, to educate the community means that we can prevent delinquency and that means calls from the public, public speeches, meetings with groups and councils, which take a great deal of the time. I would like to emphasize also, that within the last two years the Juvenile Court Department has increased its scope by 46 percent as a service to the community. That, of course, calls for a ratio comparable on salary.

Therefor, I shall be very happy to answer any questions and again I deeply appreciate the opportunity to be here today.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Thank you, Mr. Osoaks.

MR. H. C. VENSANO (Director of Public Works): I have already written to the Commission a full report on the report of your staff to you as it affects my bureau, but I come down here particularly to speak to you about the salary of the City Engineer. (The report referred to is attached to the back of this transcript.)

The City Engineer's position has been receiving $10,000 a year. It is proposed to cut it now to $7,500 entrance and $9,000 maximum.

The engineering profession is thoroughly occupied at the present time and I spent almost a year in endeavoring to locate somebody that I thought would fit that job and would take it for that price. We induced Mr. Wadsworth to give up his office, cancel some contracts, and come to work at the City Hall with the thought that he would receive $10,000 a year. The normal functions of the City Engineer, amongst a great many others, include about a million dollars worth of construction work as a normal thing. At the present time he has on his shoulders a $15,000,000 construction sewer program, sewer construction program, which is really in addition to his normal duties, and I do not feel for that reason alone, that there should be any question at all at this time of cutting his salary.

As a measure of what the position is worth, I haven't had

much time, but I have found out this; The Pacific Gas and Electric Company have a position entitled Chief Engineer, and under that position they have four or five specialists, one a civil engineer, one an electrical engineer, one in gas engineering, and so forth. I am not comparing the City Engineer to the Chief Engineer of the Pacific Gas, who gets over $20,000 but I am comparing it to these other positions and I find that the electrical engineer gets $12,800, the gas engineer $11,700, and the civil engineer, who has just come into his position, his predecessor having been just promoted to Chief Engineer, gets on entering $10,150. I think that position, if anything, is a less important position than the City Engineer's. It does not include any construction functions. The way the Pacific Gas is set up, after the plans are made and the specifications drawn and the contract let, the work is taken over by an engineer of construction who gets over $20,000 a year. So, the Pacific gas man that I have compared Mr. Wadsworth to has less diversified functions by far than the City Engineer.

In Los Angeles it is hardly any use to try and compare the City Engineer to the top men because of their high salaries there. I note, however, that in the Water Department of Los Angeles, the manager and chief engineer of the Water Department as far back as 1943 got $18,000 and the next rank under him, there are four civil engineers whose average salary is $10,500. I have no way of knowing what the maximum salary of those four are but there are four men below the Chief Engineer who get

$10,500. I think that should substantiate the $10,000 that we are asking for the City Engineer.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. WOLFF: You have another report in writing?

MR. VENSANO: I will give you a report in writing. I have given you a report in writing on everything in connection with our Department but I did not have this particular data.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Is the Engineer around now? (Referring to the fact that the lights in the room had just gone out.)

MR. VENSANO: I will leave here and see if I can find somebody. (Laughter.)

MR. L. DEMING TILTON (Director of Planning, City Planning Commission): My appearance here before you is with the approval of the City Planning Commission. It is my understanding that the City Planning Commission, through its secretary, will file a formal statement regarding their views on the proposed salary schedules. I want to talk about three items in the list involving only four persons, so, in terms of numbers, it isn't a very important matter, but from the standpoint of the performance of the office, the service which the office renders, these positions do have a very definite significance in the view of the Commission.

First, with respect to the Secretary of the Commission, the Commission has assigned larger duties to the Secretary and has indicated salary for that position corresponding to the new responsibilities of the duties. The Commission felt, when it

worked up the new duties, set up duties and responsibilities, that an appropriate salary would be something on the order of $375 to $450.

We have recently had such a deluge of requests for zoning charges and the difficulties of administering the zoning ordinance has become so great that we have felt necessity for establishing a new position, which for want of a better term or want of guidance from personnel authorities we have called the zoning administrator. In the proposed schedule that position is titled "Zoning Examiner". The Commission feels that the duties and responsibilities of that position, too, justify a salary approximately $375 to $450.

Then, we have another position: City Planning Delineator, which is an office job fitting in with the regular group of draftsmen, and it has appeared to the Commission that the talents or the abilities which we want to command for that position could not be had for salaries scaled say $250 to $300, so the Commission on that particular item would prefer a salary, would like to have a salary something on the order of $280 to $350 or $300 to $375, which would bring it into conformity with the other positions in the Department.

Then, there is a fourth position which I don't want to comment on. The City Planning Engineer, which is a position to which I have been appointed. In my own case, in that particular matter, it would be presented through formal communications from the Commission.

Thank you, very much.

MR. WOLFF: Mr. Tilton, on those jobs you just mentioned, you said there were new duties, but have either of the duties or have the duties been changed by the Commission?

MR. TILTON: I think the new duties were described to your staff.

MR. WOLFF: They haven't been changed as yet, or have they?

MR. TILTON: It is my understanding that this new schedule goes into effect July 1st.

MR. WOLFF: Have those duties been changed?

MR. SUES: Changes have been made effective next July 1st.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: On these three positions?

MR. SUES: Three different positions.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Secretary of the Commission, Zoning Examiner, and City Planning Delineator?

MR. SUES: They are the three new jobs. The salary has never been set on them.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: What is your salary now?

MR. TILTON: $10,000.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: What is the recommendation of the staff?

MR. TILTON: I don't remember what it was.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: What was the staff recommendation?

MR. SUES: That is S-800: $560 to $666.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: $550 to $600. All right, Mr. Tilton.

MR. TILTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: All right. We may proceed. Who desires

[illegible]

the floor?

MR. HERMAN van der ZEE (County Clerk): Our two classes I am particularly interested in, I would like to ask at this time whether they will be considered along with the other departments' employees in the same place later, and that is the class of General Clerk, B-222, and the class of Clerk-Typist, B-528, I believe.

MR. SUES: B-512.

MR. van der ZEE: B-512; pardon me. Anything I would have to say with regard to the proposed reduction in those two classes will be said on behalf of all employees of the City within that class, I presume, on the hearing for the B group.

With regard to the class of B-160, Law Clerk, the maximum remains the same, $250 as compared with a maximum of $275 for B-152, Courtroom Clerk. That has been a cause of considerable trouble in the County Clerk's Office for the reason that up until two years ago and for a time immemorial prior thereto, the law clerks, then called Civil Law Clerks, and Courtroom Clerks received the same money. There has been a petition presented to the Commission by the law clerks of our office, supported by a letter from myself and I believe Mr. Kline, the Director of Finance and Records, supporting the position of the law clerks in this respect.

The practical effect of the discrepancy there has been that men who took the combined examination for the old position of Assistant Registered Clerk and Courtroom Clerk as long ago as

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

twenty years are now lifting their waivers and attempting to qualify themselves as Courtroom Clerks by reason of their old status because of the attraction of the extra $25 monthly pay. The positions, in my opinion as the head of that Department, are of equal importance and deserve an equal salary and, as I say, they did until two years ago. Lawyers know that when they go to a counter at the County Clerk's Office to inquire about steps of procedure or to seek information of a more important nature, they go to a Law Clerk for that information. They don't go up to a courtroom and search out a Courtroom Clerk and ask him because the Law Clerk downstairs is meeting those problems every day and is peculiarly qualified to give that information. He is on his feet all day. He does not work a Court day, he works a full 8 hour day, on his feet, meeting the public and advising lawyers as to procedure. I would ask that the details of the importance of that Law Clerk's position which have been sent to the Commission, if they have been reviewed by the staff, be passed on to the Commission itself for a review of the determination made so far, and that the facts as set forth in them be fully called to the attention of the Commission before any decision is made.

There is one other position which I think will be brought up at another time; that is, the position of Cashier where there is a reduction, and the position of County Clerk, itself. I don't know whether it is appropriate to bring that up at this time or not.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: It is.

MR. van der ZEE: I call your attention to the fact that by the staff's own figures they arrived at the wrong conclusion and fix a salary less than the salary fixed for the Municipal Court Clerk right in this building and they fix a salary less than that paid to the County Clerk of Alameda County.

The range found by your staff corresponds generally with a private survey made by competent organization. The figures of the staff are $579 to $696 but in those figures they arrive at a maximum of $600, which is entirely out of line, and which fixes the County Clerk's salary at considerably less than what it was twenty years ago. I ask particularly that the figures of the Commission's staff be consulted and that the application of standardization of like work for like pay be fully applied as was intended as a result of the adoption of the Charter Amendment No. 1112.

MR. GEORGE MC NULTY (Adult Probation Officer): I appear here today on behalf of Probation Officers. The survey as submitted by your staff shows an average pay for Probation Officers throughout the State of a maximum of $273, but still they recommend only $260.

Now, as long as, as far back as I can remember the San Francisco Probation Officers have always stood out in front of the others throughout the State, and up until the last few years, but now we seem to be slipping back and losing ground. I think that there should be some consideration given to that

maximum set for Probation Officers, T-56.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: What is the salary now?

MR. MC NULTY: They are receiving $240 now and your staff recommends an increase to $260. They asked for $300 as a maximum and the average is $273 according to your survey.

The Probation Officer must attend court, must know a great deal about court procedures and the laws governing probation and other criminal matters. The requirements are very high and at the present time I will say I have a very efficient staff. I have been very fortunate in that respect. I haven't lost very many in help except two of my employees left because they got higher salary in both the Youth Authority and the Adult Authority. The salaries in those positions are very much higher and seem to be on the increase, than they are in the Probation Office, and we are fearful that we will lose many more to those two agencies if we don't get a higher salary for the Probation Officers.

For my own position the salary, the recommendation was left at the present standard. I feel that there should be some consideration given that. I am the executive officer of the Department. I have no assistants that relieve me; no chief assistant, and I have nine courts to oversee and they are scattered to various sections of the City. We have to go to the Juvenile Court to handle the adult work, and we have to go to the Civic Center to the Veneral Disease Court to handle that work, and I have to keep on the job to watch all of those

departments, what is going on in those various locations. So, I feel that some consideration should be given to that particular position.

I was just looking at the headline here. (Referring to a newspaper headline: "Truman asks higher wages; lower prices.")

I had nothing to do with that.

MR. WOLFF: "Lower prices"; you did not notice that one.

MR. MC NULTY: We would like to have that, also.

Thank you, very much, for your consideration. I think that George Ososke covered so much of the field there is very little left for me to say.

MR. CAMERON KING (Registrar of Voters): Gentlemen of the Commission: I feel a great deal as does Mr. van der Zee that the staff recommendations are inadequate, judged by their own figures. Before taking up the position of Registrar, itself, I wish to speak very briefly on the subordinate classifications.

I believe that it would be a serious mistake on the part of the Commission to cut the salaries of the General Clerks, the Senior Clerk, and the Head Clerk by $10 each as the staff report indicates. I believe its positions are worth fully what they are now getting. In addition to that, I believe your body will receive or have received an application from Mr. Kelleher, the Custodian of Voting Machines, in which he sets forth his duties in charge of one and three-quarters million dollars worth of City property, the voting machines located at the warehouses, and in which he asks for an increased

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

salary. The range suggested, I believe by your staff, lifts him to $315, but I think $350 would be more nearly a correct figure in connection with the valuable work which he does. That work will be outlined in his letter to you.

(The letter referred to is attached to the back of this transcript.)

Now, in regard to my own position, I wish to say this, that as you will recall, two years ago I presented a case for being raised to $600 maximum on the basis of the figures which the staff at that time found and on the comparison with some 16 other positions where the general pay in other public jurisdictions was lower than that indicated for the Registrar who got $600. There were circumstances which prevented my getting the raise at that time, and I am now asking and have a letter before your Honorable Commission sent in last August for a salary which is more nearly commensurate with the salary now paid to the Registrar of Los Angeles.

The Registrar of Los Angeles now gets $575 to $715, I believe is her range. The position as a comparative position, or, the duties of the position are this: That the Registrar in Los Angeles conducts the State and County elections. I conduct not only State and County elections but also all City elections as well as all special elections of the City. The Registrar of Los Angeles is under the direction, the control of the Board of Supervisors acting ex officio as the Board of Election Commissioners. I am, by the terms of the Charter,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

given the exclusive management, control, and direction of all matters touching registration, election, the holding of elections, and all matters pertaining to it. I believe that the added responsibility which is on the office of Registrar of Voters in San Francisco more than makes up for the difference in the size of the two communities. The office of the Registrar of Voters of San Francisco, or the office, the Department of Registration and Election, if you can call it that, has been independent for 67 years. For a long time it was under the control of an Election Commission. In 1932 that Election Commission was abolished and the sole responsibility, all the work which they did was piled onto the Registrar. There is a great responsibility there. Some of that responsibility is indicated by the fact that I control over $2,000,000 worth of City property, voting machines in warehouses, and other paraphernalia. Also, the annual budget of the Registrar's Office is over $300,000. Just to compare it with the County Clerk or the Tax Collector, it is twice the sum of money in the budget of those two Departments; of each of them. I have control, of course, complete control, of the selection of polling places, the appointing of election officers. There is no authority over me in that regard. It is a responsibility which I must exercise and for which I must be responsible. That is not true down in Los Angeles, nor is it true in any other county in the State. In all other counties the Registrar and Elections are under the control of the Board of Supervisors

and in Los Angeles the Board of Election Commissioners. The Supervisors acting as such select the polling places and appoint the election officers, and they have the responsibility of seeing that those elections are conducted properly in those election precincts. Here, it is the responsibility alone of the Registrar of Voters.

I don't care to take more of your time at the present time, but I would ask the privilege of submitting to you another letter directly to you taking up this matter.

Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: No, not at this time, unless Mr. Wolff has.

MR. WOLFF: None.

MR. THOMAS TOOMEY (County Recorder): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have three particular classifications in my office that I think desire a matter of protest, namely, Cashier B and Cashier C. Cashier B, the present range is $275 to $325, and under the staff recommendation it has been reduced to from $250 to $300. For Cashier C, the present range is $200 to $250, and is reduced in the recommendation of the Civil Service Staff to $185 to $220.

The reason for my protest is that I believe that the cashiers, Cashier B and Cashier C in my office, have somewhat different duties from those of other offices. The part of their duties that contemplates the estimates of fees and the collection and accounting of monies is a very small part of their

duties. The cashier's window in the Recorder's Office is the fountainhead of the office. It is there we receive instruments for recording and these men must be familiar with all of the State laws relating to the recording procedures in order that they properly record instruments that come in. There are a great many papers offered for recording that are not fit subjects for recording and there are others that the Federal Laws prohibit us from taking, and unless these men know exactly what their duties are, the office is apt to get into a great deal of difficulty by accepting instruments that are not proper for recording purposes.

Now, in addition to that, as Mr. Wolff probably knows, and every lawyer in San Francisco that deals with the office knows, if we were to accept every instrument that comes in during the day without pointing out defects in the instrument, we would have a great deal of litigation, and it is only through the fountainhead of this sort in the office that these papers coming in, that we are able to assist the clients of the office in pointing out defects in the papers and showing errors that are made, differences in form, acknowledgments that are not properly executed or attached to the instrument, and so on, and I believe that in fixing the salaries of these two positions, particularly, that the Commission should take into consideration the knowledge of the State Law that is required in order to efficiently carry on the duties and responsibilities of these positions. The salary now paid is

to my mind, in my opinion not adequate. It should be increased, but it certainly should not be decreased. There is a decrease in the recommendation of the maximum salary for cashier C of $30, and Cashier B of $25 per month.

The other position is that of Head Clerk. We have two Head Clerks in the office, one who has complete jurisdiction over the transcribing of instruments into the record, and in that department also we catch many errors in transcribing the instruments, and unless that man is fully conversant with the State Law there is apt to be error in the record that would be very difficult to correct or impossible to correct after they are once transcribed.

The other Head Clerk has jurisdiction over nine General Clerks and I believe that his position is somewhat comparable to that of Senior Civil Law Clerk in the County Clerk's office, whose salary range I believe has been increased to $310 a month maximum, whereas the Head Clerk has been decreased from $300 to $290.

Outside of that, the only other suggestion I can make, along with many other protests that undoubtedly will be filed on the classification of General Clerk and General Clerk-Typist: our experience in the last calendar year in employing temporary General Clerk-Typists in the office is that we had a turn over of 29 General Clerk-Typists to keep five people employed for a full year. That means that they come into the office, work a fewweeks or a month or two, and find out that they can earn

more money elsewhere at outside employment, and leave us for that employment. If it is as difficult to get help in that regard now -- and it is exacting work and hard work -- I believe that to reduce those salaries would add a burden to the office that would make it still more difficult for us to get help. I know the records of your own Commission will show that in the last five or six months you have not been able to give us any help at all in that regard. We have had to recruit our help from outside sources, principally the United States Employment Service. I ask your consideration of these protests.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: You have the job of Recorder?

MR. TOOMEY: I am not saying anything about that.

MR. JAMES A. HUGHES (Department of Weights and Measures): Gentlemen, of course you know I have a very small department, but it is a very important one and it is through our efforts that we have saved the public at least half a million dollars a year. The men I have in my department are good men. The Senior Inspector and the Inspectors are doing a good job down there. There is a recommendation that there be an increase of $10 in their salary. I think that at this particular time that it would be appropriate to do so. The Senior Inspector, during my absence, he assumes my duties, and I would be very, very glad indeed if their salaries were left as is. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Is that all?

MR. HUGHES: That is all, gentlemen.

MR. L. J. CLARKE (City Librarian): I wish to call the

attention of the Commission to two positions which I feel do not fit into the -- or, rather, the salary ranges which have been set up do not fit in with the organization setup of the Library Department. In the setting of the salary ranges for the X Division, the Library group, I believe that the Commission has set scales for two positions which appear in the B classification which in the opinion of myself and the Library Commission are far more important as to their responsibilities and duties for the respective positions. The two positions which I refer to are Assistant to the City Librarian, which has been classified in the B classification, which we have protested in the past should be classified in the X classification, the classification B-423.

I notice, and I imagine it is because of the time element which confronted the Commissions' staff, that no comparative data was compiled by the employees of the Civil Service Commission. I note, however, that a symbol "A" which denotes that fact that the employee herself has reported a higher position for her, a higher salary for her classification, but which had not been -- I imagine because of the lack of time and need of getting this document prepared as quickly as possible for the presentation to the Board of Supervisors -- had not been verified by the employees of the Commission.

It has been our contention, and I think if the Commission should analyze the correspondence which we have sent in since 1942 when the Library employees became subject to the Salary

Standardization, the provisions of the Charter, that we have contended that this position should be in the professional classification. It is a type of a position which never could be filled by the promotive examination of employees of the Municipal Government from the clerk's group. It requires a distinct knowledge of the technical processes of librarianship and I would say that this position is comparable to that in the X classification of Chief Librarian, of which there are two, namely, the Chief of Circulation and the Chief of Branches.

The other position which I refer to is the position which I recently vacated in ascending to the City Librarianship, and that is the Secretary of the Library Commission. Under Section 43 of the Charter, the positions of City Librarian and Secretary are appointive. The Secretary has charge of all the maintenances, the upkeep of buildings, all the financial procedures of the Department, has charge of the building maintenance personnel, and in addition serves, as you might say, as Public Relations Officer of the Library Commission.

I notice that your staff reports a reported salary rate -- let me find this; pardon me a moment. B-72 reports salary ranges from public jurisdictions average adjustment range of $305 to $377. They are the figures compiled by your employees. The highest verified, verified employee reports, is $417. However, the wages -- I can't say what their formula is, I am not familiar with how they weight these and obtain the basic wage which they recommend of $290 to $350, but it is considerably

under its own findings of $377 and by a great amount under the $417 which has been verified by the staff of the employees recommending. However, in turning over to the X group just for a matter of comparison between the two, I notice in the X group in the matter of Head Librarian, that their findings were $244 to $299, and yet they recommend salary range for that particular position slightly above what they found to be true in outside public jurisdiction, or, $250 to $300 per month. I merely point those two instances out and I think it is about the only two that really affect our Department, that is, the organization setup of the Department, the relative importance of the positions in the Library. I think, if those two positions are not corrected to fit into our organization scheme, it will result in a lowering of the morale of the entire staff, which is rather embarassing, to have people giving orders to others who are receiving more money than you are yourself.

I would like to add one word in defense of our general and senior clerks. I know that they are dealt with in an over-all picture of that particular classification, but let me say this, gentlemen, in the Library Department the General Clerks and the Senior Clerks are well worthy of the maximum they are now receiving, and in my opinion it should be more.

Thank you.

MR. M. H. GERRY (Purchaser of Supplies): Gentlemen, I have what I think, I am sure must have been an oversight on the part of the staff in the determination of the probable salary

of the General Foreman Machinist, Class M-2. This gentleman's salary is to remain static, whereas the Foreman Machinist has been recommended $1.88 a day increase, which exceeds the General Foreman's salary by 88 cents. Likewise, the general classification of machinist has been raised $1.88 a day which puts them within 12 cents per day of the General Foreman Machinist. I think in the past it has been the policy to have the General Foreman Machinist be at least $2.00 a day above the regular classification and the Foreman Machinist would be $1.00 above that.

I trust that in the recommendation that is made, that you gentlemen will consider the possibility of the spread in there, because the General Foreman Machinist definitely has complete jurisdiction over the Foreman and the men below him.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: We will have a short recess; about five minutes.

(Whereupon a recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: We will proceed.

MR. JOSEPH J. PHILLIPS (Director of City Property): I understand, from the letters sent out from this Commission, that there would be other meetings, and I also know that you like to have filed with you the statements in writing. I was contemplating filing before the 24th, which I think is the deadline, my statement to be used at your meeting of the 31st, when you take up the people in my Department. However, I do want to say at this time that I was very much surprised when I

saw that report and saw that certain positions in my Department were cut when I felt very sure that they would be increased, and I don't want to let the opportunity go by of not entering a protest at this time.

I appreciate that it is the position and not the applicant which governs the salary. Personalities cannot enter into it. On the other hand, I also appreciate that any staff going over all of the various classifications and doing a great deal of thinking about placing salaries cannot go beyond that particular scope, and they do not go out as they possibly should in order to give justice and see just exactly what the work of the Department is, regardless of that scope.

I know that there are many positions in private employment, and the staff will find them out by going to the Railroad Commission, that would justify so much more of an increase in the salary that I am getting that some people would say it is absurd, but those salaries are paid just the same.

I think that instead of coming under G, my Department should come under F, and I notice that under F-706 you have the Chief Valuation Engineer in the City Attorney's Office now receiving $450 to $560, and in the proposed schedule $450 to $540, while you are passing the Assistant Director of Property at $450. To me, this is absolutely ridiculous and absurd. Any investigation of the character of the work would show the Assistant Director of Property's work is far more important and should carry a much greater compensation.

As I say, I do not want to lose this opportunity and have it said, "You had your day in court and you didn't come in." I am here and I am entering a protest against them and I am telling you that in conformity with what I think is your wish, I have a letter with the various arguments for the positions in my office ready by the 24th, to be present on the 31st. It is the responsibility that is placed on the position and the capabilities of the man who is necessary to fill it that should govern the salary.

MR. WOLFF: Can't you have your statement in sooner?

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I dictated it to the girl and the girl is working on it, and our work is very much on demand for the reason that your salaries that you are setting up are such that we can't get additional help, just as one of the previous speakers stated. We are working under pressure all the time.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Mr. Wolff says that if everybody is going to wait until the 25th, the last day --

MR. PHILLIPS: The 25th is not the last day; the 24th is the last day for your meeting on the 31st?

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: That is right.

MR. PHILLIPS: I will endeavor -- today is the 21st; if I can get it in, I will try to get it in by the 22nd or the next day.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: I would like to do a good job. It is a little bit difficult when we have all of these together, to go over all of them.

MR. PHILLIPS: I appreciate that, but that is the way I read the letter and I thought I had until the 24th to do it and I thought I had better go down to the meeting today.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: It says to the 24th, but we hope you will have it in before.

MR. PHILLIPS: Just as you state, "Meager and insufficient data," I am going to send some of that data down here to you.

MR. WOLFF: The sooner you can get it down the sooner we would like it, because I will recheck it again.

MR. PHILLIPS: I say, I will try to get it in tomorrow afternoon if possible. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: As Commissioner Wolff said just now, we do hope that you executives don't all wait until the last day, and that goes generally for everybody in the City. Get it to us just as quickly as possible.

MR. ROBERT MILLER (Director of the Steinhart Aquarium): I want to refer to three categories of employment in the Steinhart Aquarium, W-150, the Attendant, in which the present range is $150 to $185, has been recommended $150 to $180, and Aquatic Biologist Assistant, Y-106, the present scale of $185 to $225, is recommended to be reduced to $180 to $215.

In these categories you will notice that no data are given from private employment or from other public jurisdictions. I recognize that the staff of the Commission has had great difficulty in classifying the positions where they can't find comparable positions elsewhere. However, I don't feel that these

positions should arbitrarily be cut without supporting data. Position Y-42, Chief Installer -- that is one found in the museums in the City as well as in the Steinhart Aquarium -- the present range is $200 to $225, and the recommended range is $200 to $215. In that case the recommended range is lower than the range shown in the private employment or in public jurisdiction. I can't see anything in the report to support that cut.

I may mention further that these positions were classified and standardized last year and I feel that it is unfortunate for the morale of the men to set a salary range in one year and reduce it a year later.

Thank you.

MR. ELMER GAETJEN (Executive Secretary, Coordinating Council): I would like to call the attention of the Commission to the classification B-69, which happens to be my position. I notice in the survey that in the public jurisdiction average adjustment range, I was very careful to look through the entire survey submitted by your staff and I find that most of the indicated new schedules comply pretty much with the range as set up in the public jurisdiction average adjustment range, other than in the classification of the Secretary of the Coordinating Council, and they give as a reason for that that this is a special -- no; it is a rate established to maintain equity with other classifications, but in my search through the scope of the work of other secretaries, I don't

predicting activity worldwide? In any nation, economically just, treating it-self, taking initiative — since it is our first, in the measure in the city as well as in the industrial economies — you commit energy to this in order, and provide more in order as well. In this case the environment which is there the energy which is the primary responsibilities. I would now consider the time, which is more than just.

— I may mention further that there is nothing with regard and effectiveness that some and I feel that it is independent the time which of the energy to a point which is where the and which is in a new level.

Thank you.

Mr. Alan Bailey (Executive Director, Transportation Economics): I think that we will ask the Minister of the Environment to take questions first, which because of his or her position I think in the Minister of Transportation. Minister, I know you have a very, very busy schedule, I know, and I feel that the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Transportation may wish to be with us for a few minutes, which is why we are in the middle. Questions relative to Minister Ross in the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Transportation, and then we'll go back to the Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not in the [illegible] committee, but I'd be happy to [illegible] some of the work of other committees.

find anything which would compare with the position which I hold.

I serve at the pleasure of the Commission. I have no executive to work under. In other words, I am the executive of this particular Department and you will note in this range that it is way below the range and the salaries paid in other areas, which are about the same setup as San Francisco. Not only that, my job combines two duties: That of the Director of the Youth Welfare Committee and District Coordinator for the District Coordinating Council. So, I would like to have that as a matter of record at this time that I am protesting that and I will submit a letter giving the details.

MR. WOLFF: Will it be in right away?

MR. GAETJEN: Yes, it will be. Thank you.

MR. W. F. MITCHELL (Director of the Bureau of Personnel for the Public Utilities Commission): I am appearing here on behalf of Mr. James H. Turner, the manager of the Utilities, who regrets that he could not be present due to the fact that there was an OPA hearing at this time on the streetcar fare charge. With your permission, may I sit down, gentlemen?

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Surely.

MR. MITCHELL: We are appreciative of the Herculean task which your staff has accomplished in preparing an extensive salary survey, particularly in view of the fact that Civil Service itself has been so understaffed for the many duties and responsibilities that fall in this province.

Obviously a report made under such conditions could not be correct in all respects. You have so noted in your letter to Mr. Turner of January 17, 1946. As a brief to work from, the report is good, and we will, of course, present to you those exceptions which we feel are in order to give just compensation for the duties and responsibilities of the positions in the Public Utilities group.

We feel that appointive offices should have a set salary rather than a salary range. Mr. Turner is requesting that in every case you establish this type of salary for his appointees. His thinking is as follows: The appointive man is selected because it is presumed he has the ability to do the job. He enjoys no Civil Service Tenure and is subject to instant dismissal on his failure to perform. Therefor, since the man is subject to dismissal without the benefit of Civil Service protection, he should not be subject to a Civil Service salary range. He respectfully requests that you give these factors consideration in setting the new salaries for all appointees under his direction. For top executive positions, such as Manager of the Railway, Hetch Hetchy, and the Water Department, Mr. Turner expects to submit to you recommended salaries which will closely follow a qualified independent survey which has been made. From the policy standpoint, there will be deviations made from this report. He, however, requests that the Civil Service Commission more closely follow this report in their consideration of these top salaries in the Public Utilities

Commission.

Now, I would like to take these up in this order. First, will be the general office:

At this time B-55, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Public Service, the present schedule of $400 is not adequate and it is our belief that the proposed schedule of $330 to $400 is not justified. An independent survey indicates the range for this position of $350 to $500 and we so recommend.

B-22, Assistant Director of the Bureau of Accounts: Your proposed new schedule indicates an increase in the maximum with no increase in the minimum. We do not consider the maximum or the minimum adequate compensation for the duties and responsibilities involved in this position. An independent survey recommends $450 to $600 as a proper range, and we ask that this be granted.

B-77, Executive Secretary to the Manager of the Utilities: To bring this position in line with public jurisdiction averages presented in your report, we recommend a range of $350 to $450 as against your indicated new schedules of $350 to $420.

The next heading, the San Francisco Airport:

F-50, Maintenance Chief for the San Francisco Airport: Your staff report indicates that no survey was made of this position. An independent study would indicate that there is no comparable airport in the State of California of a similar size and rendering such a complete service. To our knowledge it is the only airport that serves both sea and land planes.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Since the duties and responsibilities of the Maintenance Chief will multiply in excess of any comparable study that could be made, we therefor request that a salary range of $350 to $425 be established.

F-51, Airport Attendant: The duties and responsibilities of this position require more experience and knowledge than is required in the labor classification. Therefor, we request that a salary range of $180 to $220 be set.

F-52, Crew Chief, San Francisco Airport: The duties and responsibilities of this position are such that during a tour of duty these men are in charge of all airport ground facilities. For this reason, we do not believe that your staff report reflects a just compensation. We respectfully request a salary range of $225 to $275 for these positions.

F-61, Superintendent of Airport Operation: Your staff report for this position indicates that a study was not made. The duties and responsibilities of this job far outrun the present salary schedules and also the indicated new salary schedule in your report. An independent survey shows a salary range of $500 to $750 would be in order, and we so request.

The next heading will be the Hetch Hetchy:

A-12, Supervisor of Maintenance and Repair, Hetch Hetchy Properties: We note on this the classification should be F-4060, Assistant Engineer, Civil, and that salary range is O.K.

E-128, Superintendent of Power Houses: This cut is not warranted. Definitely not on the strength of the responsibility

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

carried by the Superintendent. He would receive less than the Power House Electrician under his direction. We recommend a salary of $300 to $400.

F-108, Architect: This should be treated in the same manner as F-412, Engineer, and the indicated salary shown in that case is satisfactory.

F-356, Electrical Engineering Inspector: Should parallel F-104, Senior Draftsman, with a salary range of $300 to $400.

F-410D, Engineer, Civil, Public Utilities: While your highest report shows $575, private studies of this particular position indicate a salary range of $400 to $550 is justified.

F-412B, Senior Engineer, Civil: Your staff report indicates the highest salary paid for this position to be $698. A private survey indicates that this salary range should be $500 to $750.

J-66, Garageman: At these rates Hetch Hetchy is unable to attract garagemen to employment and we recommend the rate be $8.50 a day.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: That is the union rate?

MR. MITCHELL: That is? I don't know. This is more or less off the record, but I believe our problem of garagemen is the out of town situation in Hetch Hetchy. I am not sure, Mr. Maxwell.

N-102, Streetlighting Inspector: While the increase from the range of $225 to $275 to $240 to $290 is justified, this class should be made equal to E-4, Electrical Inspector, carrying a salary range of $275 to $330.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

0-60, Sub-Foreman Gardener; Here again I would like to diverge for a minute and call your attention to the headlines in the daily papers where the request for wages is continued. In view of the inflationary tendency we do not believe the modest cut made in this recommendation is in order.

0-60.1, Foreman Gardener: The same applies in this recommendation as in the case of 0-60. We do not believe a cut is in order.

The Municipal Railway:

B-103, Cashier C: The cashier in the Municipal Railway is in complete charge of money handling, including accounting and banking approximately $50,000 a day, with approximately 8 employees under her supervision, including the Tellers. No reduction in her classification, but possibly recommendation of an increase because of responsibility in handling money. Duties and responsibility entitle this position to a classification of B-105, Cashier B, rating $275 to $325.

B-308, Calculating Machine Operator: Particularly in the comptroller group, they are not available for hire at the present schedule. Therefore, the proposed cut would definitely not be in order. We are simply not able to get those operators at our present salary.

C-104, Janitor: Here again is the problem of attracting people to the position at the present low rate and we suggest that you strongly consider an increase for that class.

C-104.1, Car Cleaner: Due to difficulty in getting

qualified people to fill these positions, we feel that the recommended salary range should be increased by approximately $10 on the minimum and on the maximum.

G-107, Working Foreman Janitor: For reasons given in the previous notes, this cut is not justified.

G-102, General Claims Agent: Your survey indicates a high not verified of $650 for this position. Private investigation indicates that this position should carry a range of $600 to $750, and we so recommend.

J-66, Garageman: This classification is obviously too low since general labor is raised to $8.50 a day. In this market it will become increasingly difficult to fill garagemen positions with this differential existing.

J-68, Sub-Foreman Garageman: For reasons stated in J-66 above, this classification should be increased to $9.00 a day.

M-6, Superintendent of Equipment and Overhead Lines: Your staff report indicates no verification of any comparable salary in this classification. Private sources indicate that the salary range for this position should be from $500 to $750 instead of $500 to $600, and we so request.

S-60, Instructor, Municipal Railway: The duties and responsibilities of this position are not fully covered in the title. The Instructor of a Municipal Railway actually is a Chief Instructor having under his immediate direction approximately 22 Special Instructors, and as such, any cut in compensation would be unwarranted since his duties and obligations are of

a semi-administrative nature.

S-122, Senior Inspector: We consider this position a very important position in the railroad, Mr. Wdff. Your staff report indicates no outside check on this position. We do not feel that the present compensation in any meets with what the duties and the responsibilities of the job indicate. This man is in charge of 69 Inspectors. He is also in charge of or has supervision over approximately 100 Collectors and Starters. Prior to consolidation with the Market Street Railway Company, this man carried the title of Chief Inspector, which more closely reflects the duties and responsibilities of his position. For this reason we recommend a salary of $250 minimum or $300 maximum.

S-124, Supervisor of Schedules: This is another position that we feel is very badly out of line. Your staff report indicates a cut of $5 in this position on the maximum to $295 and would leave the minimum of $240 as at present. A nation wide survey indicates salary ranges for these positions running from the minimum of $290 indicated to a high of $787.50. It is our contention that the only comparable job in the State of California would be the Supervisor of Schedules in Los Angeles who enjoys a salary of $367 a month. We maintain that there are peculiarities surrounding our operations which are not comparable anywhere else in the State of California, and for that reason we request a salary range for this position from $350 to $400 per month.

S-128, Division Superintendent: Again we have a situation here that we feel is vitally important. These men are actually on the firing line and operating the railroad. The present schedule indicates in your report a minimum of $300, maximum of $375. Your recommendation is a cut to $300 minimum and $360 maximum. We maintain that the duties and responsibilities of this position in the Municipal Railway actually entitle the Division Superintendent to an increase rather than a decrease. We respectfully call your attention to the situation of S-120, Day Dispatcher. Your interquatrate range indicates $187 to $190, and you have recommended a new salary of $240 to $290. Using the same thinking we respectfully request that the Division Superintendent be paid $350 to $400.

Assistant Superintendent of Transportation, Municipal Railway -- Pardon me; S-130: Your staff report indicates all salaries for this position which were studied were considerably in excess of those now paid. Therefor, instead of the $5 cut you suggested on the maximum, we request a range of $375 to $450. Outside sources indicate that this range should be $350 to $500.

S-132, Superintendent of Transportation: Your report indicates that no survey was made of this position and an independent report indicates that the salary range of $450 to $600 would be in order and we so request.

S-134, General Superintendent of Transportation: Your report indicates no study of this position, with the highest

verified salary $833. Independent studies indicate that a salary range of $500 to $750 would be in order and we so request.

I don't think I have covered the problem of our Senior Accountant and I was under pressure when I was making this up, gentlemen. It has just now occurred to me I didn't hit the Senior Accountant in the Railway. We feel that the position of Senior Accountant, while it is one class that will carry tremendously increased duties and responsibilities in certain spots, that it would not in certain other spots, and we recommend --

MR. WOLFF: Off the record.

(Discussion was had off the record.)

MR. WOLFF: It might be well to put it in. When reference is made to an independent survey. He has in mind -- what do you call that, the executive's report?

MR. MITCHELL: I missed that?

MR. WOLFF: What do you refer to when you refer to that?

MR. MITCHELL: This is Loven's Report.

On this Senior Accountant in the railway, we recommend a salary range of $350 to $400, or $450.

We are now taking over the Water Department:

B-14, Senior Accountant: Your staff report indicates public jurisdiction average for this job of $360 to $438. Your highest verified report is $435. An independent survey covering six checks on similar positions indicates proper compensation would be arange of $350 to $450 and we so request.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

B-104, Senior Teller: As applied to the work in the Water Department the present schedule is probably in line with the duties and responsibilities of the position. There is no justification for $10 reduction on the minimum and maximum, particularly in view of the inflationary tendency nation wide.

B-234, Head Clerk: Your staff report indicates a high salary reported of $335 a month. An independent survey indicates a proper salary range for this position of from $300 to $350. Certainly there is no indication that a cut from the present schedules is warranted.

MR. WOLFF: May I interrupt for a moment to inquire?

MR. MITCHELL: Surely.

MR. WOLFF: About this independent survey: Was that checked?

MR. SUES: Yes; Lovens' Report. Yes.

MR. WOLFF: Do I understand that it wasnot found to be correct?

MR. SUES: All of the allocations that Lovens had in that report were checked and the ones that in our opinion were not comparable when compared to the statement of our position were not verified, and the positions that were comparab le we verified, and it shows on the report in the same manner as employee letters. So, in those classes it probably has an "A" where it indicates that the job in our opinion is not a comparable position to ours.

MR. MITCHELL: B-247, Meter Reader: Public jurisdiction average indicates a range for this classification of $161 to

$198. The present schedule of $160 to $200 does not seem out of line and certainly the increased cost of living would not warrant the cut indicated in your new schedule of $160 to $190.

B-311, Bookkeeping Machine Operator: Your staff report indicates the highest reported salary of this position is $208. Following the same reasoning as above, the Meter Reader, we do not believe that the $10 cut on the maximum from $200 to $190 is justified.

B-312, Senior Bookkeeping Machine Operator: The same reasoning as in the case of B-311 applies to this classification and we do not feel that the $20 cut on the maximum and the $10 cut on the minimum is justified.

B-454, Telephone Operator: The $25 cut indicated on the maximum, and the $15 indicated cut on the minimum does not meet with our approval, particularly for the Water Department. Independent surveys made by the Telephone Company show that this particular switchboard during the peak hours is handling an excess of work. I would like to add here that the same reasoning goes for the telephone operators for the railway.

B-458, Chief Telephone Operator: The indicated cut from a maximum of $250 to $210 and the minimum salary reduction to $175 from $200 does not meet with our approval for the following reasons: Your telephone operator in many cases is your first and only contact with the public. It represents to a degree almost an administrative approach in public relations. We feel that this position if properly filled is entitled to the present

salary schedule.

C-107, Working Foreman Janitor: Your indicated cut on the maximum from $200 to $190 does not seem to be justified for the following reasons: Increased cost of living and the rapid inflationary rise in our economy will mean that these salaries will be obsolete on the downward side by the time they are put into effect.

F-526, Chief Water Purification Engineer: Your staff report indicates the highest reported salary for this position is $478. An independent survey indicates that the salary range for this position should be $400 to $650. We considered the duties and responsibilities of this job to justify this indicated range.

M-266, Foreman Meter Repairer: It is our contention that there is not sufficient spread between M-265, Meter Repairman, who is actually a labor graduate with no specialized skill and this classification of Foreman Meter Repairman. The duties and responsibilities of this position are much more adequately compensated under the public jurisdiction average shown in your report than in your indicated new schedule. Therefor, we recommend that the range be in keeping with the public jurisdiction average, $11.75 to $13.50.

M-270, Superintendent Machine Shop and Equipment, Utilities: Your staff report indicates public jurisdiction average for this classification ranges from $314 to $391. The duties and responsibilities of this position in San Francisco Water

Department are such that a salary range of $325 to $375 would be more in keeping as a fair compensation.

N-420, Consumers' Complaint Investigator: Your highest verified report for this position is $330 and the public jurisdiction average shown is from $225 to $299. We can therefore see no justification for the suggested reduction of $10 on the minimum and $10 on the maximum of this position. We feel that the schedules now in force should remain.

O-60, Sub-Foreman Gardener: In view of the public jurisdiction average shown in your report and again referring to the inflationary trend that is evident in this country and the excessive cost of living in San Francisco, we can see no justification for $5 reduction on the maximum of this position.

O-60.1, Foreman Gardener: Following the same thinking as in the case of the Sub-Foreman Gardener we do not feel that the reduction of $15 on the maximum in this case is justified.

U-44, General Manage r and Chief Engineer -- wait a minute: That I want to skip. That is one of the cases that Mr. Turner will take up with you a little bit later.

The next will be U-56, Assistant Supervisor, Consumer's Accounts: Your staff survey does not make a report on this classification. An independent survey which has been made indicates the salary range for this position should be $300 to $450 and we so recommend.

U-112, Pipe Calker: Due to the nature of the duties and responsibilities of this position, it is recommended that the

Commissioner Jack Smith, with a number equal to 48.5 is into which would be given the function of a fifth commissioner.

Q-(Mr. Chairman) - Mr. Commissioner Jack Smith, I have brought to your attention certain facts which appear to be both you the chairman investigation committee or investigation for the legislative committee of the on the chairman and the in the chairman of this committee. We feel that this investigation has to focus almost exclusively.

A-(Mr. Jack Smith) Commissioner. In view of the above particularization of facts which appear to your committee and which relevancy to the individuals involved which do attempt to this committee and the committee with of Illinois in the investigation on the behalf of this committee.

Q-(Mr. Chairman) Commissioner. Considering the above statements in the view of the investigation committee do you feel that the committee is not the required to make them in question.

A-(Mr. Jack Smith) Sir, I feel that the committee - that is a matter that we make. That is one of the issues that Mr. Chairman will take up with you a little bit later.

The main will be right, certainly investigation committee. Commissioner Jack Smith, I feel that the committee is required to make a determination. In investigation matter which has been made investigation the matter which this committee should be right to make the question.

Q-(Mr. Jack Smith) Sir, do you feel that it is the function of the committee to make the determination of this question. If it is necessary that the responsibility of this question.

indicated new schedule be raised an additional $.05 to equal the Compressor Operator, Portable, U-108 pay scale. The reason for this is readily understood when it is known that frequently on the job the Pipe Calker may actually direct and supervise the Compressor Operator's work.

U-124, Special Complaint Inspector: We do not feel that the public jurisdiction average range shown, nor the highest verfied reported salary for this position reflects the ability needed to handle the job. Actually this man represents the public contact as well as the service man dealing with our consumers. We, therefor, recommend a salary range of $225 to $275.

U-127, Water Service Inspector: Since the high range on your public jurisdiction average indicates $247, we do not believe that the indicated reduction to $240 on maximum is justified. We request that the present schedule remain.

U-136, General Foreman, Service and Meters: Inasmuch as the public jurisdiction indicates a high range of $359 and the highest verified reported salary is $400, we feel that the duties and responsibilities of this position require a range of $300 to $360.

U-140, General Foreman, Main Pipes: In keeping with your public jurisdiction averages and to properly reflect compensation for the duties and responsibilities of this position in San Francisco, we recommend that the salary range be $325 to $375, instead of $300 to $360 as indicated in your new schedule.

U-144, Superintendent City Distribution: We do not feel that the present schedules are adequate compensation for this position and are not in keeping with the public jurisdiction averages indicated in your staff reports. An independent survey of this position indicates that a salary range of $600 to $850 is in order and we so recommend.

U-212, Ranger: Your proposed schedule in this classification would equal the compensation for Reservoir Keeper and the duties and responsibilities of this position are not comparable. We do not feel that the indicated raise is justified and suggested that the present salary range of $165 to $190 be maintained. In this connection we further suggest that the working hours of the ranger be considered for redistribution in keeping with the needs of the job, and I might interpolate here just a bit: The purpose of the Ranger is to make these deer patrols at around 5:00 to 7:00 in the morning with practically nothing to do from then on until the evening patrols around 4:00 to 7:00 of an evening, and it was the rearranging of these hours where I believe the Civil Service rub was that you had to work the 8 hour day from 8:00 to 5:00 and the deer refuse to comply with that. So he put in the odd hours.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Make a ruling.

MR. MITCHELL: We can't train them.

U-232, Superintendent of the Alameda District: The duties and responsibilities of this position are not reflected in the present salary range of $280 to $350. Actually, while the man

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

is paid for five days, he is working six and cannot, of course, collect overtime. Also, he is subject to 24 hour call. For these reasons we request that a salary range be set of $325 to $400.

U-236, Assistant Superintendent, Peninsula District: The present salary schedule of $280 to $350 does not reflect just compensation for the duties and responsibilities of this job. The man does not receive overtime, works six days a week and is on twenty-four call. We therefor recommend a compensation of $325 to $400 . It should be noted that we are not asking for a raise in a similar position, U-231, Assistant Superintendent of the Alameda District for the reason that this man does receive overtime and he is adequately compensated.

U-246, Superintendent of the Peninsula District: Your staff report fails to indicate any report verified salaries in this classification and an independent report covering 9 such positions indicates this salary range should be $450 to $600, and we so request.

V-40, Superintendent of Agriculture: Here is another position that is very important and out of line because probably it has been a position that has been hard to assess. Your staff report shows that no studies were made of this position and it is our belief that the duties and responsibilities of this job are more closely comparable in responsibility to the Assistant Director of Properties for the City and County of San Francisco than probably any other position. Certainly

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the present schedule and the proposed schedule of $270 to $325 does not adequately compensate for these duties. We therefor recommend a salary range of $375 to $450.

Now, here are some general overall recommendations on some of these lower classifications, or miscellaneous employments, let's call them.

B-6, Senior Bookkeeper: The Civil Service Commission's staff recommended $225 to $270. We recommend $225 to $275, present schedule.

B-102, Teller: The staff recommends $200 to $240. We recommend a present schedule of $200 to $250.

B-222, General Clerk: The staff recommends $160 to $190. We advocate the present schedule of $160 to $200.

B-228, Senior Clerk: The staff, $200 to $240. We recommend the present schedule of $200 to $250.

B-308, Calculating Machine Operator: The report recommends $155 to $185. We recommend the present schedules, $150 to $190, and then would like to know where we can get them.

The same thing with the bookkeeping machine operator, B-311. We recommend the present schedule of $160 to $240.

B-312, Senior Bookkeeping Machine Operator: Your recommendation is $190 to $230. Ours is $200 to $250.

B-302, Addressing Machine Operator: The Commission's staff recommends $150 to $180. Our recommendation is $150 to $190.

B-408, General Clerk Stenographer: The staff recommends $160 to $190. Our recommendation is $160 to $200.

[illegible] Mr. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

B-412, Senior Clerk Stenographer: The staff recommends $200 to $240. Our recommendation is $200 to $250.

B-512, General Clerk Typist: The staff recommends $160 to $190. Our recommendation is $160 to $200.

B-516, Senior Clerk Typist: The staff recommends $200 to $240. Our recommendation is $200 to $250.

MR. WOLFF: Those are maintaing the present scale?

MR. MITCHELL: That is right, and I want to thank you for listening to all this detail.

MR. WOLFF: What recommendation, if any, has your Department with reference to the Motormen and Conductors? Is that a sigh of relief?

MR. MITCHELL: Well, I am not ducking the issue, Commissioner Wolff. There has been something said and I will be dashed if I know what it was. Since Thursday I have prepared all this data and I have just been swamped and I don't know. I think that the plan is that Mr. Turner is to make a separate recommendation to you on those platform people, contingent upon this raise going in. You see, this OPA hearing is today. We haven't got that raise in yet. So, obviously, there can't be any recommendation for a raise, I am sure, from Mr. Turner. I think that what our discussion was, that it would be contingent on this raise. I am sure that was it. I am not trying to avoid the issue but I am really not sure what was said, but I believe that is it. Mr. Turner has gone on record that if this increased fare structure is established he would be in favor for a raise

for the platform personnel. Does that answer your question?

MR. WOLFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MAXWELL: Is there anybody else to be heard? If there is nobody else to be heard, the meeting will be concluded.

(Whereupon the meeting was concluded at 5:10 o'clock, p.m.)

---000---